UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/018,313	05/09/2002	Veijo Vanttinen	NOKIA.4009US	1629

43829 7590 05/18/2007

ROBERT M BAUER, ESQ.
LACKENBACH SIEGEL, LLP
1 CHASE ROAD
SCARSDALE, NY 10583

EXAMINER	
PEREZ, JULIO R	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2617	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/18/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/018,313	VANTTINEN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Julio R. Perez	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *23 August 2006*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *66-100 and 102-133* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *66-100 and 102-133* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 86 is objected to because of the following informalities: On line 2, insert -- the -- between "to" and "network". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 102 recites the limitation "said external network" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 66-100, 102-133 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant' s submission of prior art, Ludwig et al., WO 99/04582 (hereinafter Ludwig) in view of Havinis et al. (US006360102).

Regarding claims 130, 131, 132, 133, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses a method (and apparatus) comprising: a first station (mobile device) which is in communication with at least one network element (GSM base station), [page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5], said first station

being arranged, in use, establish a connection with an element external to said network via said at least one network element [page 14, paragraphs 2-3],

but is silent on wherein one of said first station and said at least one network element is provided with a dedicated address for receiving a request from said external element as to the location of the first station, wherein any request received at said dedicated address is a position request.

Havinis teaches positioning request by external elements such as location applications; i.e., taxi companies, emergency agencies, which request a position of a mobile station (i.e., first station) to a GMLC, a network element (col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-56).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Ludwig, such that generating a request to a location center, to provide the exact location of the mobile with prior identification of the requester in order to provide security and privacy to the mobile station.

Regarding claims 66 and 86, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses an entity (mobile device, D2, Figure 3) connectable to the network via said first station (GSM mobile station), said method comprising the steps of: defining an association between said entity and the first station [page 14, paragraphs 3, teaches communication between the MD, laptop with a mobile station, mobile phone], said association comprising information identifying said entity and information identifying said first station [page 14, paragraphs 3-4, mobile phone and portable computer identify each other via communication interface]; determining the location of said first station

and based on said association, the mobile station may correspond to the entity or the first station [page 14, paragraphs 3-4, provide location of the mobile device via the mobile phone].

Regarding claim 67, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses storing association between the entity and the first station [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5, teach storing means fro saving information regards to relationship between the mobile and portable terminal].

Regarding claim 68, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the association is stored in a store external to said network [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 69, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein said store is arranged to store information identifying said network [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 70, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the entity requesting identifying information from the first station [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 71, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the entity sending information identifying said first station to said store [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 72, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the first entity sends information identifying the entity to the store [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 73, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said network is a wireless network [Ludwig, Fig. 9].

Regarding claim 74, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said network is a cellular network [Ludwig, Figs. 8-9].

Regarding claims 75, 122 Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said first station is a mobile terminal [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2, lines 1-3; Figure 3].

Regarding claim 76, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said information identifying said mobile terminal is one or more of its MSISDN and its PDP address [Ludwig, page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 77, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said entity is an IP entity [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; Figure 3, teach a laptop, IP element or entity].

Regarding claim 78, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said information identifying said IP entity is an IP address [Ludwig, page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 79, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said entity is a portable computer [Ludwig, page 14, paragraph 3, lines 6-7; Figure 3, teach a laptop connected to a mobile device, i.e., a mobile phone].

Regarding claim 80, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses authentication procedure is performed between the entity and the first station [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 81, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses an authentication procedure is performed between the entity and the network [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 82, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said entity is arranged to request an IP address and said network allocates an address [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 83, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the entity is arranged to establish a connection with an IP location service provider and to provide the IP location service provider with the information identifying the entity and the information identifying the first station [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 84, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the information identifying the entity and the information identifying the first station is provided to an IP location server via the network [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 85, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the entity is provided with information relating to the identity of the first station [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 87, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses an entity which is arranged to store information relating to the location of said first station (mobile device, D2), at least one network element (mobile station) being provided between the first station and said entity (base station), said entity being arranged to

receive requests relating to the location of said first station from a requester external (the Internet server) to said network [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-56].

Regarding claim 88, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses an entity has interface with an external dement [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5; Figure 3, the portable computer has connection to a mobile phone via an interface; a PCMCIA data card].

Regarding claim 89, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein said external element is a communications element, which permits the entity to communicate to outside said network [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5; Figure 3, the mobile phone provides communication for the laptop to the wireless network via the mobile phone].

Regarding claim 90, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein said external element is the Internet [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5; Figure 1].

Regarding claim 91, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein said requester communicates with said external element [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5, the mobile phone may communicate with the Internet].

Regarding claim 92, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein a plurality of networks are provided, said networks being arranged to communicate via said external element [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15,

paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5; Figures 1-6, a plurality of network elements, MSC's, HLR's, communicate with the Internet as well].

Regarding claim 93, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein said entity is arranged to store information defining in which network said first station is in [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5; Figures 1-6].

Regarding claim 94, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein each of said networks comprises an entity [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5, every element within the networks comprises an entity; i.e., an MSC within a network].

Regarding claim 95, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, where said entity is arranged to forward the requests to a respective network element in accordance with the information stored in said entity [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-56, a request is passed on to a GMLC to locate the mobile].

Regarding claim 96, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, when said network element is a GMLC [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-56, teach a GMLC].

Regarding claim 97, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein said network element is arranged to direct a response back to said requester [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-56].

Regarding claim 98, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein if said first station is in a different network, the request from the requester is

forwarded by the entity to the network in which the first station is located [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-65].

Regarding claim 99, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein said request carried via the same means as user information from the external element to the first station [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-65].

Regarding claim 100, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein a transmission plane is provided between said first station and said external element, said request and user information being sent to the first station via the transmission plane [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-65; col. 7, lines 3-21].

Regarding claim 102, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, wherein information on the location of the first station is provided to said external element via said dedicated address [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 103, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, said dedicated address is a dedicated port within a user address [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 104, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, user information is received by and/or transmitted from a location in one of said first station and said at least one network element which is different to the dedicated address [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 105, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses, first station is allocated an address, said address being unique to said first station [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 106, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses first station is allocated an address, said address being reallocated to different first stations when no longer required by said first station [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 107, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said address is allocated by said at least one network element [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 108, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said dedicated address is located in said first station [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 109, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses at least one network element is transparent to information sent between said first station and said external element network [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 110, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses first station is arranged to obtain information as to its position in response to a request received at its dedicated address [Ludwig, page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 111, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the first station is arranged to calculate the position of the first station [Ludwig, page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5, the mobile is capable of calculating its own position].

Regarding claim 112, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the first station receives information as to its position [Ludwig, page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5, the position may me sent from a GPS]

Regarding claim 113, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said request from the external network includes information identifying the first station and the dedicated address [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 114, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses at least one network element is arranged to check requests from the external network to the first station and if a request identifies the dedicated address, to initiate a procedure for providing information to the external network relating to the position of the first station [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-65; col. 7, lines 3-21].

Regarding claim 115, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the dedicated address is in said at least one network element [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 116, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the at least one network element is arranged to obtain information identifying said first station in response to a request for the position from said external element [Havinis, col. 6,

lines 25-33, 53-65; col. 7, lines 3-21page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4-page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 117, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the information is the dialing number of said first station [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-65; col. 7, lines 3-21].

Regarding claim 118, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the information identifying the first station is forwarded to a further network element, said further network element being arranged to provide information on the position of the first station identified by said information [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-65; col. 7, lines 3-21].

Regarding claim 119, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the position information is provided to the external element by said further network element directly or via said at least one network element [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-65; col. 7, lines 3-215].

Regarding claim 120, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the information identifying said first station is sent to the external network element, said external element sending a further request to a further network element including said identifying information requesting information on the position of first station, said information being forwarded to said external element [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-65; col. 7, lines 3-21].

Regarding claim 121, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses at least one network element obtains said information on the identity of the first station from a register [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-65; col. 7, lines 3-21].

Regarding claim 123, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said network is GPRS network [page 11, paragraph 3].

Regarding claim 124, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses at least one network element is a GGSN [page 11, paragraph 3].

Regarding claim 125, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses further network element is a GMLC [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-65].

Regarding claim 126, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses said external element is connected to said network via the Internet [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5].

Regarding claim 127, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the network is a packet data network [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5; Figures 1-6].

Regarding claim 128, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the request relates to the location of said first station [Ludwig, page 14, paragraphs 2-3; page 15, paragraphs1-4- page 16, paragraphs 1-5; Figures 1-6].

Regarding claim 129, Ludwig in view of Havinis as applied above discloses the request causes a geographic positioning procedure to be started by said first station [Havinis, col. 6, lines 25-33, 53-65; col. 7, lines 3-21].

Conclusion

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 66-100, 102-133 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Julio R. Perez whose telephone number is (571) 272-7846. The examiner can normally be reached on 10:30 - 6:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William G. Trost can be reached on (571) 272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Julio R Perez
Examiner
Art Unit 2617

5/14/07

WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600